

Remarks:

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's confirmation of receipt of Applicant's claim for priority and certified priority document under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

Reconsideration of the application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 8, 10 - 23 and 26 - 37 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 34 have been amended. Claims 9, 24, 25, 38 and 39 have been canceled.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that item 7 of the above-identified Office Action indicated that claims 25, 26, 29 and 34 - 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, Applicant has amended claims 1, 29 and 34, as suggested in the Office Action. More particularly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations of formerly allowable dependent claim 25, including all of the limitations from any intervening claims. Similarly, Applicant has amended allowable claims 29 and 34 to include all of the limitations of the independent claims from which those claims depended, and from any intervening claims. Thus, Applicant's amended claim 1 corresponds to former claim 25 (i.e., claims 1, 9, 24 and 25), claim 29 has been amended

Applic. No. 10/825,755  
Response Dated December 31, 2007  
Responsive to Office Action of September 10, 2007

to additionally include the limitations of former claims 1, 9 and 27 and claim 34 has been amended to additionally include the limitations of former claims 1, 9, 10 and 33.

Thus, for the reasons set forth in items 8 - 10 of the Office Action, among others, Applicant's independent claims 1, 29 and 34 are believed to be patentable over the prior art.

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 9, 24, 27, 28, 30 - 32, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 6,757,348 to Vila et al ("**VILA**") in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0084250 to Gaither et al ("**GAITHER**"). In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 3 - 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **VILA** in view of **GAITHER**, and further in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0063396 to Yu ("**YU**"). In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 14 - 17, 21 - 23 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **VILA** in view of **GAITHER**, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,700,825 to Ebergen ("**EBERGEN**"). In item 5 of the Office Action, claims 12, 13, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **VILA** in view of **GAITHER**, further in view of **YU** and further in view of **EBERGEN**. In item 6 of the Office Action,

Applic. No. 10/825,755  
Response Dated December 31, 2007  
Responsive to Office Action of September 10, 2007

claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **VILA** in view of **GAITHER**, further in view of **YU** and further in view of **EBERGEN**, and further, in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,772,269 to Kaganoi ("**KAGANOI**").

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections, as applied to the amended claims.

More particularly, claims 9, 24, 37 and 38 have been canceled from the instant application, thus mooted the rejections of those claims. Further, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite all of the limitations of former claim 25, which was indicated as being allowable in the Office Action.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 29 and 34. Claims 1, 29 and 34 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1, 29 or 34.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 - 8, 10 - 23 and 26 - 37 are solicited.

Applic. No. 10/825,755

Response Dated December 31, 2007

Responsive to Office Action of September 10, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 31 2007

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Additionally, please consider the present as a petition for a one (1) month extension of time, and please provide a one (1) month extension of time, to and including, December 31, 2007 to respond to the present Office Action.

The extension fee for response within ,a period of one (1) month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please provide any additional extensions of time that may be necessary and charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant  
December 31, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101

Kerry P. Sisselman  
Reg. No. 37,237

12/31/2007 PCHOMP 00000030 10825755

01 FC:1251

120.00 OP